

## REMARKS

It is noted with appreciation that the Examiner found allowable matter in dependent claims 2, 4, 6, 8, 10-15, 17 and 19 and would allow these claims if in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

On the other hand, claims 1 and 3 were rejected under 35USC 102 for anticipation by the patent to Rockot 5,793,586. Claims 5, 16, 18, and 20 were rejected under 35 USC 103 for obviousness over Rockot in view of Gold 5,593,224. Claims 7 and 21 were rejected for obviousness over Rockot in view of Vercelloti 5,774,000. Claim 9 was considered obvious over Rockot in view of Yamaguchi 5,828,112.

The opportunity afforded by the Examiner for his telephonic interview with inventor Dr. M.J. Hennessy on May 15, 2007, is greatly appreciated. At that time the rejection of claim 1 as anticipated by Rockot was discussed. The Examiner's attention was directed to the fact that Rockot provides an interrupter in a DC line and refers only to the major event of opening the switch. Rockot is not intended for and does not describe repetitive switch opening and closing. No agreement was reached regarding claim 1.

It is respectfully submitted that Rockot is not analogous art and does not anticipate the present invention. Nevertheless, for economic reasons to bring this case to an expeditious conclusion the Examiner's suggestion, that indicated allowable matter be included with base claim 1, has been followed in the above amendments.

In particular, the allowable matter of claim 4 has been included in independent claim 1. It is therefore respectfully believed that claim 1 is now allowable. Claim 4 was cancelled. Claims 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 16, 18, 20, 21, which depended directly or indirectly from previously presented claim 1, continue their dependencies on claim1 (currently amended) and are also thereby believed to be allowed.

Claim 2, containing allowable subject matter, has been amended to independent format by inclusion therein of the limitations of claim 1 as previously presented on 1-25-2007. Accordingly claim 2 is believed to be allowable together with claims 12-15, 17, 19 dependent directly or indirectly therefrom.

Claims 8 and 10 were found to contain allowable matter. They have been cancelled and replaced substantively and respectively by new independent claims 22 and 23 that also include in each new claim the limitations of claim 1 as previously presented on 1-25-2007. Accordingly, claims 22 and 23 are believed to be in condition for allowance.

An earnest effort has been made to be fully responsive to the Examiner's objections. In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance. Every claim either contains previously indicated allowable subject matter or is dependent on such a claim. This amendment does not add new matter. Allowance of this case is earnestly solicited. However, if for any reason the Examiner should consider this application not to be in condition for allowance, he is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further Action.

A fee (\$100) for an additional independent claim in excess of three is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Leonard Cooper  
Registration No. 27,625  
Attorney for Applicant

999 Grant Avenue  
Pelham Manor, New York 10803  
(914) 738-6276